

B<sup>1</sup>  
(a) implanting a suitable dopant in a portion of the drain region adjacent the gate for forming the body region to have a desired drain/source threshold voltage, and

(b) implanting a suitable dopant in the said portion of the drain region adjacent the gate for forming the body region to have a desired breakdown voltage through the drain region,

steps (a) and (b) being performed in any order, and the dopant being implanted in step (a) by directing the dopant at a first angle to the surface plane of the drain region for directing at least some of the dopant beneath the gate, the first angle to the surface plane at which the dopant is directed in step (a) being less than a second angle to the surface plane at which the dopant is directed in step (b).

B<sup>2</sup>  
13. (Amended) A method as claimed in Claim 1 in which the dose and energy levels of the dopant implanted in each of steps (a) and (b) are sufficient for providing the desired drain/source threshold voltage and the desired breakdown voltage through the drain region.

#### REMARKS

In the Official Action of January 31, 2002, claims 1-15 were all rejected. Of these, claims 1 and 13 were rejected as indefinite and in two separate rejections, claims 1-15 were held to be obvious over prior art.

#### The Section 112 Rejection

In response to the rejection of Claims 1 and 13 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. In Claim 1, the term "gate" is introduced for the first time with the indefinite article, and then is subsequently referred to with the definite article. In Claim 13 the term "breakdown voltage" has been qualified as "desired breakdown voltage". Consequently, the rejection is overcome.